DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 423 JC 920 029

AUTHOR Belcher, Marcia J.
TITLE Costs vs. Benefits: An Evaluation of the Academic Alert System. Research Report No. 91-02R.
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., Fla. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Jan 91
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; Computer Uses in Education; *Cost Effectiveness; Counseling Techniques; High Risk Students; Program Budgeting; *Program Costs; Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Alert System; Miami Dade Community College FL

ABSTRACT

At Miami-Dade Community College, the Academic Alert (AA) system informs students about their progress midway through a semester through the use of individualized letters based on faculty reports on student progress and attendance. In 1991, an evaluation of the AA system was undertaken to determine system costs; ascertain the benefits of the system; and determine the validity of the information provided through the system. Three different surveys were sent to the following groups: 882 full-time faculty members; 172 administrators; and 893 students. Study findings, based on response rates of 60% for faculty, 44% for administrators, and 37% for students, included the following: (1) almost 90% of the costs associated with the AA system were time related and not associated with actual budget dollars; (2) elimination of the AA system would result in a yearly savings of $30,000 in actual dollars, while factoring in personnel and computer time would increase this figure to $284,153 annually; (3) over two-thirds of the faculty and administrators thought that students would know where they stood at mid-term without AA, as did one-third of the students; (4) of the students who reported that their letters said they needed to improve their performance, 80% said they made some changes; (5) 72% of the students said the information they received was accurate, and over 80% thought the information they received was helpful; (6) the largest group of faculty and administrators (40%) thought only students in academic difficulty should receive letters; and (7) new students were more likely to rate AA information helpful than returning students. Appendixes provide a calendar, activity schedule, letters and questionnaires sent to each of the three groups surveyed; and statistics. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340423

Miami-Dade Community College

MIAMI-DADE IS AN EQUAL ACCESS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AND DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF HANDICAP. 4/88

COSTS vs. BENEFITS: AN EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC ALERT SYSTEM

Research Report No. 91-02R

January 1991

Institutional Research

Marcia J. Belcher
Research Associate, Sr.

Figures for Tables Prepared by
Carol Patterson
Staff Associate

JC920029

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Belcher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Miami-Dade Community College

John Losak, Dean

Table of Contents

Page

List of Figure and Tables ii

Introduction 1

Purpose of the Study 2

Methodology and Procedures 4

Results 5

What Are the Costs of Academic Alert? 5

Out-of-Pocket Costs 6
Time Costs 6
Perception of Costs 7
What is "Too Costly"? 7

What are the Possible Benefits of Academic Alert? 7

New Information 7
Improved Performance/GPA 8
Information for Advising 8
Other Uses of Data 8

How Valid is the Academic Alert Information Provided? 9

Knowledge of the Academic Alert System 9
Common Definition of Satisfactory Progress 9
Accuracy of Information 10

Should Everyone Receive an Academic Alert Letter? 10

Summary 11

Appendix A 19-20

Appendix B 21-22

Appendix C 23-29

Appendix D 30-41

List of Figure and Tables

Figure — Page

1 Operational Costs of Academic Alert System Per Term Based on Fall 1990, Data 14

Table

1 How Much Time Per Semester Do You Spend Dealing With The Academic Alert System (e.g., Filling Out Forms, Talking to Classes and Faculty About Academic Alert, Counseling Students After They Receive Their Letters)? 15

2 What is Your Guess on How Much Each Academic Alert Letter Costs Including Paper, Postage, Personnel And Computer Services? 15

3 We Should Eliminate Academic Alert if the Actual Dollar Savings to the College Exceeds: 15

4 Value of Information Provided Through Academic Alert 15

5 Effect of Academic Alert Letters 16

6 Did Students Change Their Behavior Based on Academic Alert Letters? 16

7 The Academic Alert Information on the AGIS Form is Used to Advise Students 16

8 Additional Administrative Uses of Academic Alert System 17

9 Which of the Following Best Describes the Academic Alert System? 17

10 Talk About Academic Alert 17

11 There is General Agreement About What Constitutes Satisfactory Attendance or Performance 17

12 Perception of Value of Academic Alert Information By Students Who Receive Letters 18

13 Academic Alert Letters Should Be Sent To: 18

14 Student Reactions to Academic Alert Letters Based on Number of Semesters and Academic Performance 18

Costs vs. Benefits: An Evaluation of the Academic Alert System

Introduction

About 12 years ago, the College undertook the task of systematically assuring that students were informed about their progress mid-way through the semester through individualized letters that each student received. It was thought that such a system would help students successfully complete their current semester, as well as provide information to advise students for their next semester. The approach was labelled the "Academic Alert" system. It was implemented along with the Standards of Academic Progress (SOAP), which placed students on warning or eventual suspension if satisfactory progress was not made at the end of each semester.

Academic Alert letters were based on reports that faculty completed on student progress and attendance. A computer program known as RSVP (Response System with Variable Prescriptions) was already in existence and was used to write the letters. The letters differed based on the faculty evaluations and included information about where students could go on their particular campus if they needed help. There are 150 different messages which can be combined into over 25,000 unique letters for students.

The number of Academic Alert letters sent has increased over time. At first, only freshmen received the letters during the Fall and Winter semesters. Then the system was expanded to also include continuing students. After a 1984 Self-Study recommendation, the system was further expanded to include 12-week courses in the Spring/Summer term.

Academic Alert rolls are distributed to each class during the sixth week of each major semester and are due during the eighth week of class. The letters are then produced and mailed to students during the ninth week of class. (See Academic and Administrative Calendar in Appendix A and Academic Alert Activity Schedule in Appendix B.)

Several studies have been done on the Academic Alert system. Among the earliest was one by Zeien (1980). Studying only new students on South Campus, he found that students reacted positively to Academic Alert letters but made few behavioral changes. Findings were based on telephone surveys and follow-up assessment with instructors of a group of students who had been told they needed to improve.

A study by Anandam (1984) tried to ascertain the effect of Academic Alert letters on grades. Students were randomly divided into an experimental group who received their letters and a control group who did not. She found that students who received the letters had a higher term grade point average (GPA=2.32) than students who did not (GPA=2.28). The groups remained similar on their cumulative GPA. m credits dropped, and cumulative credits dropped.

The 1984 non-traditional Self-Study also included an evaluation of the Academic Alert System as part of a review of Student Information and Performance Standards. The recommendations included expansion of the System to the 12-week Spring/Summer Term, common definitions of satisfactory attendance and performance, and better follow-up after letters are received.

Purpose of the Study

This evaluation of the Academic Alert system was undertaken at the request of the College President. Though compliance in completing the rolls is still high (97% returned for Fall 1990), Faculty Senates on each campus have voted to eliminate the Academic Alert system as a way of saving time and money, especially during this period of tight budgets. The College President, however, has asked for more information, especially from students, before agreeing to eliminate the system.

This study, therefore, addressed the following questions:

1. What are the costs of Academic Alert?

    a. How much time do faculty and administrators spend on Academic Alert?

    b. What other personnel costs are there?

    c. What is the bottom-line cost of the Academic Alert system?

    d. How much of that cost is in actual out-of-pocket dollars (e.g. postage and mailers)?

    e. How much is Academic Alert perceived to cost?

    f. At what dollar value is the system perceived to be "too costly"?

2. What are some possible benefits of Academic Alert? Does the Academic Alert system:

    a. Provide new information to students?

    b. Result in mid-semester changes that students otherwise would not make?

    c. Provide information for advising?

    d. Lend itself to other uses of the data?

3. How valid is the information provided through the Academic Alert system?

    a. Do faculty, administrators, and students know about and discuss the Academic Alert system?

    b. Is there agreement on what constitutes successful performance for students?

    c. How accurate is the information that students receive?

4. If the Academic Alert remains, does it need to include all students? How much would costs change if only some students were included?

Methodology and Procedures

The heart of this study was a set of three surveys--one for faculty, one for administrators, and one for a sample of students (see Appendix C for surveys and results). Prior to finalizing the surveys, copies were sent to the Academic Affairs Committee, the Research and Testing Committee, and the Student Services Committee. The final surveys were based on the input of these groups, along with input from several other individuals.

Of all 882 full-time faculty, 531 or 60% returned their surveys. The respondents were almost all (98%) full-time faculty. About two-thirds (66%) had been at the College more than ten years. A large majority (84%) described themselves as classroom faculty; an additional 7% were department chairpersons. Only 1% (or 7 respondents) described themselves as academic advisors.

Administrators who were surveyed were limited to those with academic responsibilities and who had a job code of department chairperson or above. Of the 172 surveyed, 76 or 44% returned the surveys.

To assess student reactions, a 10% sample of sections of ENC 0020, MGF 1113, and PSY 1000 were drawn. Of the 284 sections which remained after labs, independent study, outreach, and mini-terms were eliminated, 29 sections were selected. Of the 893 students included on these class rolls, surveys were received from 333 or 37%. (We were not able to tell which specific sections or students responded.)

Most (62%) of the student respondents were in their first semester at M-DCC, while only 23% of those who received Academic Alert letters were new students. About 20% self-reported that they were on academic warning. The students who responded to the survey were somewhat more likely than all Fall enrollees to report that their Academic Alert

letter indicated they needed improvement. For the respondents, 62% said they were told they needed improvement. For all students sent letters for Fall 1990, 45% needed improvement in at least one course (see Appendix D for full Fall results from the Academic Alert report). Thus, the group of students responding to the survey was not reflective of the student body as a whole.

The distribution of the surveys was timed to coincide with the completion and mailing of the Academic Alert letters. Faculty were asked to give the surveys to their students during the week of November 5th through 9th, the week after students should have received their letters. Most students (83.5%) recalled receiving letters. Faculty and administrators received their surveys shortly after the Academic Alert rolls were turned in on October 23rd.

In addition to the surveys, a variety of interviews were conducted. The members of the Academic Alert committee from each campus were interviewed along with the Registrar or other individual involved in the processing of the Academic Alert rolls. Dr. Kamala Anandam, who helped design and who oversees the system, was also interviewed along with RoseAnn Roche, who handles day-to-day details. Estimates of computer costs were obtained from A. L. LeDuc, Director of Computer Services.

Results

What Are the Costs of Academic Alert?

There are two kinds of costs associated with administering and maintaining the Academic Alert System. One kind of cost is up-front and budgeted. It involves out-of-pocket expenses for stationary and postage. Another kind of cost is not included in anyone's budget. It is hidden because it is enfolded into the everyday workings of the College. This kind of cost includes personnel and computer time spent on the Academic Alert system. While not directly budgeted, this time would be spent on other activities if not spent on the Academic Alert system.

Figure 1 shows the total operational costs of the Academic Alert system for the Fall 1990 semester. You will note that the expenses are divided into out-of-pocket costs and time (non-budgeted) costs.

Out-of-Pocket Costs: The out-of-pocket costs are the place where the College could free up actual dollars if the Academic Alert system were eliminated. You will note that out-of-pocket costs were $12,415 for the Fall 1990 semester. Assuming that the Winter term involved the same number of classes and students and the Spring/Summer term was only one-third the size of either major term, the annual cost for 1990-91 would be approximately $28,968. Thus, the College would release about $30,000 that could be spent elsewhere.

Time Costs: The time costs encompass 90% of the total operational costs of the Academic Alert system. The largest part of the time costs consists of faculty time. Assuming that the survey returns reflect the responses for all faculty, it was estimated that full-time faculty members spend about five hours per semester on Academic Alert with a cost of approximately $20 per hour. It was further estimated that an additional 200 part-time faculty each spent an hour on Academic Alert for a total faculty cost of $88,000. An additional $10,000 was added for administrator time based on survey results. (See Table 1 for responses of faculty and administrators to time estimates.)

Besides faculty and administrator time, there are the tasks of distributing the forms and entering the rolls at the Registrar's Office. An additional $1,200 (or 120 hours) was added for department time to handle the rolls and $840 to enter the data at the Registrar's office. Estimates were obtained from each Registrar or designee on the amount of time and personnel needed to process the rolls. The estimates were based on the assumption that the processing went smoothly; estimates varied from 10 hours to 32 hours (2 persons taking 2 days).

The remaining personnel costs involve time spent revising, maintaining, and overseeing the program as it is running. A total of 72 hours or $1,050 was budgeted for this part of the process.

The last time cost involves the computer rather than any personnel. Computer Services estimated that computer time used by Academic Alert amounted to approximately 131 CPU minutes. Again, while these costs do not occur specifically in any Academic Alert budget, the time spent running the Academic Alert system is time spent not running other jobs on the computer.

Perception of Costs: As indicated at the bottom of Figure 1, the total cost of each Academic Alert letter is approximately $2.53 based on this set of estimates. (Counting only stationary and mailing, the cost is $.26 per letter.) Over 60% of faculty and administrators, however, guessed that the system cost less than $2.00. Slightly more than 20% guessed the system cost $3.00 or more. Administrator estimates were somewhat lower than faculty estimates. See Table 2 for full results.

What is "Too Costly"? One major impetus for the faculty push to eliminate Academic Alert was the dollar savings to the College. As part of the survey, faculty and administrators were asked how much actual dollar savings would be needed in order for them to urge that Academic Alert be eliminated. As shown by Table 3, 43% of the faculty and 31% of the administrators thought Academic Alert should be eliminated even if the savings were less than $50,000.

What are the Possible Benefits of Academic Alert?

New Information: One potential benefit of Academic Alert letters is giving information to students that they otherwise would not have about their course performance and student services available to them. Table 4 displays the results of two survey items that were used to tap this concept. While a large majority of faculty (76%) and administrators (68%) thought that students would know where they stood at mid-term without Academic Alert, only 36% of the student respondents thought so. In addition, while less than 20% of

faculty and administrators thought Academic Alert letters provided new information, over 50% of students thought they did.

Improved Performance/GPA: Even if new information is gained, students may not take the necessary steps to either improve their performance or withdraw from their classes. Zeien (1980), in an early study of the Academic Alert system, found that students reacted positively to the letters but did not take action, discuss them with others, or seek advisors' help. In this study, about 40% of faculty and 60% of administrators thought at least some students withdrew from a course after receiving an Academic Alert letter (see Table 5). Close to 50% of faculty and administrators thought that some students improved their performance or attendance after receiving an Academic Alert letter (see Table 5).

The student survey, however, indicated more positive results. Slightly over 60% of those receiving letters reported that their letter indicated they needed to improve in one or more of their courses. Of those who needed to improve, 80% said they did make a change (e.g., dropped a course, attended more regularly, studied more, saw an advisor). Of course, this study relied on self-report which may result in overly optimistic estimates.

Information for Advising: The information from the Academic Alert letter is placed at the bottom of the AGIS form so faculty and advisors can use it to help place students in proper courses for the next semester. Student Services members of the Academic Alert Committee from each campus strongly indicated that this information has been helpful in the advising process. However, as shown by Table 7, only about 40% of administrators and 30% of faculty think Academic Alert information is used to advise students.

Other Uses of Data: Academic Alert, like many systems, has some side benefits besides informing students of their progress. Interviews revealed that Academic Alert rolls are used on South campus to drop students for non-attendance instead of asking faculty to fill out additional purge rolls. Other information gets updated as a result of the Academic Alert system (e.g., advisor codes, addresses, list of resources available for

students). In addition, violations of policy (e.g., self-advising) are obvious from studying the Academic Alert reports (see Appendix D).

Several administrators have also asked for lists of specially identified students for follow-up projects. For example, the coaches on North and South want to know about the athletes' progress. Several campuses ask for rosters of black students who are not making satisfactory progress according to the Academic Alert letters.

According to the survey of administrators, however, few have taken advantage of this follow-up capacity. As shown by Table 8, only about 30% have used Academic Alert information to target groups of students for special attention. Less than 40% thought that Academic Alert had some administrative uses beyond informing students of their progress.

How Valid is the Academic Alert Information Provided?

Knowledge of the Academic Alert System: More knowledge of the system indicates a more informed user. As shown by Table 9, over 90% of faculty and administrators correctly identify Academic Alert as a mid-semester appraisal of course progress. Over 60% of students also selected this option; 20% indicated they did not know.

Talk about Academic Alert also occurs among the various groups surveyed. More than half (57%) of administrators said they talk to faculty about Academic Alert. About the same percentage of faculty (58%) said they talk to students about Academic Alert. Somewhat fewer students (48%), however, recalled hearing about Academic Alert from a faculty member. (See Table 10 for full results.)

Common Definition of Satisfactory Progress: One of the problems identified with the Academic Alert system during the 1984 Self-Study was a lack of consensus on what constituted satisfactory progress. Survey results indicate that this continues to be a problem. As shown by Table 11, only 30% of faculty and 28% of administrators thought that there was agreement.

Accuracy of Information: Faculty have long complained that the information that students receive in their Academic Alert letters is inaccurate. One reason, they believe, is the three-week time lag between the time they receive the rolls and when students receive their letters. During that time, student performance/attendance may change dramatically. Other faculty say that the wording of the letters does not reflect the information they provide to the system (e.g., bubbling "does not apply" results in a message such as "no show").

Students, therefore, were asked if the information they received was accurate and helpful. Of the 83.5% or 333 students who recalled getting letters, slightly over 70% thought the information was accurate, while slightly over 80% thought the information was helpful (see Table 12). These results are somewhat puzzling since it would seem that letters would first need to be accurate before they could be helpful.

Should Everyone Receive an Academic Alert Letter?

Academic Alert began by sending letters only to new students. In addition, the initial concern was providing early information for students who might be placed on warning or suspension. Should we return to addressing only these students?

According to the Fall, 1990, Academic Alert Report (see Appendix D), 51% of the students included in the midterm evaluation had satisfactory progress, 45% needed improvement, and 4% had no information. Thus, out-of-pocket expenses would be cut in half from $30,000 to about $15,000 by limiting the letters only to those needing improvement. It is unlikely, however, that time spent would also be reduced by half since faculty would still need to evaluate all students before indicating which ones needed to improve.

Of the 48,051 students sent letters in the Fall of 1990, 11,008 or 23% were new students. Thus, the out-of-pocket costs would be reduced to $7,750 by limiting the letters to new students. Time spent by faculty should also be reduced since rosters would contain only new student names.

Survey results showed that the largest group of faculty and administrators (40%) preferred that Academic Alert letters go only to students in academic difficulty. (About 30% of faculty and 20% of administrators preferred they go to no one.) Most (70%) students, however, preferred that letters go to everyone. See Table 13 for full results.

Further analysis showed that the perception of Academic Alert letters' helpfulness and the degree to which they imparted new information varied according to the length of time students had been at M-DCC and their academic performance. After four or more semesters, students were much less likely to find the information helpful. After the first semester, students were much less likely to gain new information from the letters. There were fewer differences based on either current GPA or whether the student was on academic warning. Higher performing students were less likely to need the Academic Alert letter to let them know of their status. (It must be admitted, however, that this item is seriously flawed--too many negatives to allow an easy response.) See Table 14 for full results.

Summary

The Academic Alert system has now been a part of College life for the past 12 years. It has also been the subject of several studies prior to the current one. Zeien (1980) found that even though new students reacted positively to the Academic Alert letters, their behavior changed very little. Anandam (1984) found that an experimental group who received Academic Alert letters had a term grade point average of 2.32 compared to a grade point average of 2.28 for a control group who did not receive letters. The groups did not differ significantly on their cumulative GPA, term credits dropped, or cumulative credits dropped.

The 1984 Self-Study included a positive assessment of Academic Alert. Committee members concluded that the system should be expanded to the Spring/Summer terms, that common definitions of "satisfactory" be established, and that better follow-up of the Academic Alert letters should be initiated. At the time of the Self-Study, about 40% of

the faculty and 50% of the staff/administrators were in favor of sending Academic Alert letters to everyone.

The purpose of the current study was to address the costs of the Academic Alert system, the perception of some of its benefits, and the accuracy and helpfulness of the information given to students. The study was based on surveys of full-time faculty, academic administrators, and students. Survey data were supplemented with interviews.

Almost 90% of the costs associated with the Academic Alert system were time-related and not associated with actual budget dollars. The total cost of each Academic Alert letter was judged to be approximately $2.53. Out-of-pocket expenses (stationary and mailing) amounted to $.26 per letter. In a year, the College would save approximately $30,000 in actual dollars by eliminating the Academic Alert system. By including personnel and computer time in cost estimates, however, the savings would be $121,780 for a major term or $284,153 annually.

Students had different perceptions of the extent to which Academic Alert benefitted them compared to the perceptions of faculty and administrators. While over two-thirds of faculty and administrators thought that students would know where they stood at mid-term without Academic Alert, only about one-third of students thought likewise. Over half of students thought Academic Alert provided new information compared to less than 20% of faculty and administrators. Furthermore, of the students who reported their letters said they needed to improve their performance, 80% said they made some changes.

Though Academic Alert information can be used to advise students or to target special "at-risk" groups for further follow-up, survey results indicated that only about 30% of faculty and administrators were aware of or used this aspect of the system. Campus advisement personnel who were interviewed were unanimous, however, in the value of having Academic Alert information at the bottom of the AGIS form to use in advising students for the following semester.

It is of little value, however, to have information if it is inaccurate or lacks meaning. Faculty have complained that the information students receive is inaccurate, at least by the time the students get it. A majority of students (72%), however, said the information they received was accurate, and over 80% thought the information they received was helpful.

Should only some students receive Academic Alert letters? Faculty, administrators, and students were asked whether Academic Alert letters should be sent to everyone, new students only, students in academic difficulty, or both. (About 45% of students in the Fall semester were rated as needing improvement and 23% were new students.) The largest group (40%) of faculty and administrators thought only students in academic difficulty should receive letters. This option would decrease mailing costs by half but would still require about as much time from faculty. Responses to the student surveys indicated that new students were more likely to rate Academic Alert information as new and helpful than returning students. Fewer differences in student response were found based on academic performance.

So, in the end what's to be said? Eliminating Academic Alert would save few actual dollars but much time. It is a system that continues to have strong proponents and strong detractors. As in 1984, the largest group of faculty and administrators prefer to see the system continued but in modified form. A majority of faculty (71%) and administrators (78%) agree that Academic Alert letters should be sent to at least some students assuming that survey respondents are representative of the total group. And students seem to like it (though surveying a group that contained fewer new students might yield less positive results). The question of whether students who need to make a change in their behavior actually do so remains outside the realm of this study.

WP067

Figure 1

Operational Costs of Academic Alert System
Per Term Based On Fall 1990, Data

Out of Pocket Costs		
Stationary		$1,954.54
Progress Rolls - Form #2450 5,913 @ $140.07/thousand	828.23	
Academic Alert Letters Form #2101 - 48,051.00 @ $8.09/thousand	388.73	
Envelopes for letters 48,051 @ $15.35/thousand	737.58	
Mailing		$10,460.45
Mailing Agency Contract	610.00	
Postage 48,051 @ $.205	9,850.45	
Time Costs		
Personnel Time		$105,090.00
Faculty 880 Full-Time Faculty @ 5 hrs. each @ $20.00/hr. 200 Part-Time Faculty @ 1 hr. each @ $20.00/hr.	88,000.00 4,000.00	
Administrators 125 Administrators @ 4 hrs. each @ 20.00/hr.	10,000.00	
Departmental Handling 120 Departments @ 1hr. @ $10.00/hr.	1,200.00	
Data Entry of Rolls at Registrar's Office North Campus: 32 hrs. @ $10.00/hr. South Campus: 10 hrs. @ $10.00/hr. Wolfson Campus: 32 hrs. @ $10.00/hr. Medical Center: 10 hrs. @ $10.00/hr.	 320.00 100.00 320.00 100.00	
Program Revisions and Maintenance 50 hrs. @ $15.00/hr.	750.00	
Computer Operator Personnel Time 22 hrs.	300.00	
Computer Time		
Approximately 131 min. @ $33.00/CPU minute		$4,345.00
Total Time Costs		$109,365.00
Total Out-of-Pocket Costs		$12,414.99
Total Costs		$121,779.99
Out-of-Pocket Cost Per Letter		$.26
Total Cost Per Letter		$2.53

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

How Much Time Per Semester Do You Spend Dealing With The Academic Alert System (e.g., Filling Out Forms, Talking to Classes and Faculty About Academic Alert, Counseling Student After They Receive Their Letters)?

	I Do Not Participate In Academic Alert	Less Than 5 Hours	5 - 10 Hours	11 - 15 Hours	More Than 15 Hours Per Semester
Faculty	30 5.7%	342 64.7%	123 23.3%	11 2.1%	23 4.3%
Administrators	9 11.8%	51 67.1%	9 11.8%	2 2.6%	5 6.6%

Table 2

What is Your Guess on How Much Each Academic Alert Letter Costs Including Paper, Postage, Personnel and Computer Services?

	Under $.50	$.50 - $.99	$1.00-$1.99	$2.00-$2.99	$3.00 or More
Faculty	47 9.3%	147 29.2%	129 25.6%	72 14.3%	109 21.6%
Administrators	14 18.7%	22 29.3%	11 14.7%	13 17.3%	15 20.0%

Table 3

We Should Eliminate Academic Alert if the Actual Dollar Savings to the College Exceeds:

	$50,000	$100,000	$200,000	Even if Under $50,000	Even if Under $200,000
Faculty	132 27.8%	57 12.0%	28 5.9%	206 43.4%	52 11.0%
Administrators	21 29.6%	10 14.1%	5 7.0%	22 31.0%	12 16.9%

Table 4

Value of Information Provided Through Academic Alert

	Faculty			Administrators			Students		
	Yes	No	I Don't Know	Yes	No	I Don't Know	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Without the Academic Alert System, Students Wouldn't Know How They Stood at Mid-Term	88 16.8%	399 76.0%	38 7.2%	20 26.7%	51 68.0%	4 5.3%	199 60.9%	118 36.1%	10 3.1%
The Academic Alert Letters Provide New Information to Students	82 15.5%	360 68.2%	86 16.3%	15 19.7%	44 57.9%	17 22.4%	182 54.7%	142 42.6%	9 2.7%

WP067.1

Table 5

Effect of Academic Alert Letters

	Faculty			Administrators		
	Yes	No	I Don't Know	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Some Students Formally Withdraw From a Course After Receiving an Academic Alert Letter	216 41.1%	117 22.2%	193 36.7%	45 59.2%	6 7.9%	25 32.9%
Some Students Improve Their Performance/Attendance After Receiving an Academic Alert Letter	248 47.0%	160 30.4%	119 22.6%	39 51.3%	14 18.4%	23 30.3%

Table 6

Did Students Change Their Behavior Based on Academic Alert Letters?

	Letter Indicated I Needed to Improve in One of My Courses			
	Yes 204 (62%)		No 126 (38%)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Because of Academic Alert Letters, Made a Change (e.g. dropped course, attended more regularly, studied more, saw an advisor)				
Yes	164	80	33	26
No	33	16	89	71
Don't Know	7	4	4	3

Table 7

The Academic Alert Information on the Agis Form is Used to Advise Students

	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Faculty	147 28.5%	349 67.6%	20 3.9%
Administrators	32 42.1%	21 27.6%	23 30.3%

Table 8

Additional Administrative Uses of Academic Alert System

	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Used Academic Alert Information to Target Students for Special Attention	24 31.6%	51 67.1%	1 1.3%
Academic Alert Has Some Administrative Uses Beyond Informing Students of Their Grades	29 38.2%	18 23.7%	29 38.2%

Table 9

Which of the following Best Describes the Academic Alert System?

	Process to Tell Students Which Courses To Take	Mid-Semester Appraisal of Course Progress	Probation or Suspension For Low Grades	I Don't Know
Faculty	3 0.6%	488 93.0%	9 1.7%	25 4.7%
Administrators	2 2.6%	72 94.8%	0 0.0%	2 2.6%
Students	43 10.9%	251 63.4%	21 5.3%	80 20.2%

Table 10

Talk About Academic Alert

	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Administrators Report They Talk to Faculty	43 56.6%	33 43.4%	-- --
Faculty Report They Talk to Students	305 58.4%	212 40.6%	5 1.0%
Students Report They Heard Faculty Talk	192 48.1%	187 46.9%	18 4.5%

Table 11

There is General Agreement About What Constitutes Satisfactory Attendance or Performance

	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Faculty	158 29.9%	222 42.1%	148 28.0%
Administrators	21 27.6%	38 50.0%	17 22.4%

Table 12

Perception of Value of Academic Alert Information
by Students Who Receive Letters

	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Information in Letter Was Accurate	240 72.5%	74 22.4%	17 5.1%
Information in Letter Was Helpful	273 82.2%	50 15.1%	9 2.7%

Table 13

Academic Alert Letters Should Be Sent To:

	No One	New Students Only	Only Students In Academic Difficulty	New Students And Students In Academic Difficulty	Everyone
Faculty	153 29.3%	7 1.3%	220 42.1%	59 11.3%	84 16.1%
Administrators	17 22.4%	1 1.3%	31 40.8%	13 17.1%	14 18.4%
Students	4 1.0%	4 1.0%	80 20.2%	34 8.6%	274 69.2%

Table 14

Students Reactions to Academic Alert Letters
Based on Number of Semesters and Academic Performance

	Total in Group	Information Helpful	Gained New Information	Wouldn't Know Status
Semesters at M-DCC				
1st Semester	202	85.6%	59.4%	65.0%
2 - 3 Semesters	57	87.7%	45.6%	60.7%
4 or More Semesters	70	68.1%	40.6%	50.0%
Current GPA				
Less Than 2.0	29	82.8%	51.7%	62.1%
2.0 - 2.99	194	80.9%	55.4%	62.3%
3.0 - 4.0	86	86.5%	51.2%	51.2%
On Academic Warning				
Yes	69	81.2%	55.1%	67.7%
No	261	82.8%	55.0%	58.8%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Office of the Registrar - South Campus

ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE CALENDAR

Note: Shaded areas apply to South Campus only	1990-91					1991-92				
	FALL 90-1	WINTER 90-2	SPRING 90-3	SPR/SUM 12 WEEK	SUMMER 90-4	FALL 91-1	WINTER 91-2	SPRING 91-3	SPR/SUM 12 WEEK	SUMMER 91-4
1. Early Registration Begins by STAR SERVICE only a. New Students, Readmits, Honors, Students with cumulative GPA of at least 2.5) b. All other students (appointments not reqd.)	M Jan 29 M Mar 5	M Sep 17 M Oct 29	M Jan 28 M Mar 4	M Jan 28 M Mar 4	M Jan 28 M Mar 4	M Jan 28 M Mar 4	M Sep 16 M Oct 28	M Jan 27 M Mar 2	M Jan 27 M Mar 2	M Jan 27 M Mar 2
2. Late Registration Begins ($25 late fee assessed)	-	T Jan 8	M May 13	M May 13	W Jun 26	R Aug 29	T Jan 7	M May 11	M May 11	W Jun 24
3. On Campus Registration Begins	M Aug 13	M Dec 10	M Apr 29	M Apr 29	M Apr 29	M Aug 12	M Dec 9	M Apr 27	M Apr 27	M Apr 27
4. Interim (Mini) Term Begins	M Sep 24	M Jan 28	-	-	-	M Sep 23	M Jan 27	-	-	-
5. Non-credit: Registration Begins Mail-in Deadline Classes Begin	M Aug 6 S Aug 25 T Sep 4	M Dec 3 M Dec 31 S Jan 12	M Apr 8 T Apr 30 S May 11	M Apr 8 T Apr 30 S May 11	M Apr 8 F Jun 28 S Jul 6	M Aug 5 S Aug 24 T Sep 3	M Dec 2 M Dec 30 S Jan 11	M Apr 6 M Apr 27 S May 9	M Apr 6 M Apr 27 S May 9	M Apr 6 W Jun 24 M Jul 6
6. Faculty Reports	M Aug 27	M Jan 7	M May 13	M May 13	T Jun 25	W Aug 28	M Jan 6	M May 11	M May 11	T Jun 23
7. Classes Begin - Evening and Weekday Weekend	T Aug 28 S Sep 8	T Jan 8 S Jan 12	M May 13 -	M May 13 -	W Jun 26 -	R Aug 29 S Sep 7	T Jan 7 S Jan 11	M May 11 -	M May 11 -	W Jun 24 -
8. Last Day to Change Courses without Penalty; Withdraw from classes with refund; register, add, drop, or change sections of credit courses without signature of instructor; change to or from audit status	T Sep 4	M Jan 14	W May 15	R May 16	M Jul 1	R Sep 5	M Jan 13	W May 13	R May 14	M Jun 29
9. Last Day to Apply for a Degree	T Sep 4	M Jan 14	F May 3	F May 3	F May 3	R Sep 5	M Jan 13	F May 1	F May 1	F May 1
10. C[illegible]s Distributed 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th	M Aug 27 R Sep 6 M Sep 24 M Nov 5 M Dec 3 -	M Jan 7 W Jan 16 T Jan 22 M Mar 4 M Apr 15 -	F May 10 F May 17* M Jun 10 - - -	F May 10 F May 17 M Jun 10 T Jun 25 W Jul 3 M Jul 22	T Jun 25 W Jul 3* M Jul 22 - - -	W Aug 28 M Sep 9 M Sep 23 M Oct 28 F Nov 22 -	M Jan 6 W Jan 15 T Jan 21 M Mar 2 M Apr 13 -	F May 8 F May 15 M Jun 8 - - -	F May 8 F May 15 M Jun 8 T Jun 23 W Jul 1 M Jul 20	T Jun 23 W Jul 1* M Jul 20 - - -
11. Academic Alert/Purge Rolls - Distributed Due	T Oct 9 T Oct 23	T Feb 19 T Mar 5	- -	W Jun 12 W Jun 19	- -	T Oct 8 T Oct 22	T Feb 18 T Mar 3	- -	W Jun 10 W Jun 17	- -
12. Purge Rolls Due from Instructors	T Oct 23	T Mar 5	T May 28	W Jun 19	M Jul 8	T Oct 22	T Mar 3	T May 26	W Jun 17	R Jul 9
13. CLAST - Deadline to Register - Date of Test	F Sep 7 S Oct 6	F Jan 25 S Feb 23	F May 3 S Jun 1	F May 3 S Jun 1	F May 3 S Jun 1	F Sep 6 S Oct 5	F Jan 31 S Feb 29	F May 1 S Jun 6	F May 1 S Jun 6	F May 1 S Jun 6
14. Last Day to Drop College Prep without Counting **	W Oct 24	W Mar 6	M Jun 3	M Jun 24	T Jul 16	R Oct 24	W Mar 4	M Jun 1	M Jun 22	T Jul 14
15. Last Day to Drop Class with W or to Register for Credit By Exam	R Nov 29	R Apr 11	W Jun 12	R Jul 25	R Jul 25	M Dec 2	W Apr 8	W Jun 10	W Jul 22	W Jul 22
16. Final Grade Rolls Distributed	T Dec 11	W Apr 24	M Jun 17	T Jul 30	T Jul 30	T Dec 10	W Apr 22	M Jun 15	T Jul 28	T Jul 28
17. Last Day of Classes	F Dec 14	F Apr 26	R Jun 20	W Aug 7	W Aug 7	M Dec 16	F Apr 24	R Jun 18	M Aug 3	M Aug 3
18. Last Day of Final Exams	R Dec 20	R May 2	M Jun 24	T Aug 6	T Aug 6	F Dec 20	R Apr 30	M Jun 22	T Aug 4	T Aug 4
19. Grades Due from Faculty to Registrar at Noon	F Dec 21	F May 3	T Jun 25	W Aug 7	W Aug 7	S Dec 21	F May 1	T Jun 23	W Aug 5	W Aug 5
20. Grades Placed in the U. S. Mail	S Dec 22	S May 4	W Jun 26	R Aug 8	R Aug 8	M Dec 23	S May 2	W Jun 24	R Aug 6	R Aug 6
21. Last Day to Apply for Degree and have Name Appear in Commencement Program	M Apr 1*	M Apr 1	M Apr 1	M Apr 1	M Apr 1	M Mar 30	M Mar 30	M Mar 30	M Mar 30	M Mar 30
22. Commencement	S May 4	S May 4	S May 4	S May 4	S May 4	S May 2	S May 2	S May 2	S May 2	S May 2
23. Holidays	S Sep 1 M Sep 3 R Nov 22 F Nov 23 S Nov 24	S Jan 19 M Jan 21 F Mar 29 S Mar 30	S May 25 M May 27	S May 25 M May 27 R Jul 4	R Jul 4	S Aug 31 M Sep 2 R Nov 28 F Nov 29 S Nov 30	S Jan 18 M Jan 20 F Apr 17 S Apr 18	S May 23 M May 25	S May 23 M May 25	-

* Purge Rolls

** Final grades will be run at Mid-Term for all classes which end on or before this date.

October 8, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

RSVP ACADEMIC ALERT AND ADVISEMENT SYSTEM
FALL SEMESTER, 90/1
ACTIVITY SCHEDULE

Monday	**September 10**	CARS submits purchase requisition for mailing service and arranges for postage.
Monday	October 1	The last day for the Academic Alert Committee to update the RSVP messages.
Friday	October 5	The RSVP office submits a work order for Computer Operations to print progress rolls.
Tuesday	October 9	Registrars distribute progress rolls to faculty with a memorandum from the Vice President (or designees) explaining the Academic Alert System, what is expected from each faculty member, and the procedures on returning the rolls to the Registrar's office by October 23.
Tuesday	October 23	Faculty return progress rolls to the Registrar's office by 12:00 noon.
Thursday	October 25	Registrar's office completes entering data from progress rolls by 4:30 p.m.
Thursday	October 25	RSVP office submits a work order for Computer Operations to update the RSVP files and print statistical reports after 4:30 p.m.
Friday	October 26	The RSVP office sends statistics to Academic Advisement offices on each campus. This day is also used as a catch-up day if any problems are found in the system.
Friday to Sunday	October 26 October 28	The RSVP office submits a work order for Computer Operations to print the RSVP Academic Alert letters.
Monday	October 29.	CARS arranges to transport the letters from the Computer Center to the mailing services office.
Monday	October 29	The RSVP office distributes the letters with improper addresses to the respective Academic Advisement offices.
Wednesday	October 31	Students begin receiving Academic Alert letters in the mail.

Please note the following:

a. Faculty members are expected to provide progress and attendance information during the 8th week of classes.

b. Students receive their alert letters during the 9th week of classes.

APPENDIX C

October 29, 1990

Dear Faculty Member:

We are conducting an evaluation of the Academic Alert system. As part of the evaluation, your class has been randomly selected for administration of a survey. The section indicated on the above label is the one that was selected. (As an additional part of the evaluation, you will receive a survey that asks for your opinions as a faculty member.)

You will receive a packet containing the surveys during the week of November 5-9. We would appreciate it if you would allow approximately 10 minutes of class time for students to complete the survey. The survey packets are being handled by the Testing Office on each campus. After your students complete the survey, place all the materials back in the package and return it to the Testing Office. Please have your students complete the survey within the next week while the Academic Alert letter is still likely to be fresh in their minds.

These results will provide the first systematic data on the extent to which students attend to Academic Alert letters. Dr. McCabe has expressed an interest in the evaluation results as providing a basis for deciding on continuance of the Academic Alert system.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions or comments about the survey or process, I can be reached at the Office of Institutional Research. My current phone number is 7-2004, though after November 9th it will be 7-7488.

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Belcher
Research Associate, Sr.

sdm

Enclosures

Student Survey on the Academic Alert System

Directions: On the sheet provided, please darken the circle which corresponds to your answer. Select only one answer for each question. Use a pencil to answer.

1. How many semesters have you attended Miami-Dade?		
a. this is my first semester	245	(62.0%)
b. 2-3	70	(17.7%)
c. 4 or more	80	(20.3%)
missing/miscoded 4		
2. What is your current grade point average at M-DCC?		
a. less than 2.00	34	(9.2%)
b. 2.00 - 2.99	239	(64.2%)
c. 3.00 - 4.00	99	(26.6%)
missing/miscoded 27		
3. Are you currently on academic warning or probation?		
a. yes	78	(19.7%)
b. no	317	(80.3%)
missing/miscoded 4		
4. Which of the following best describes the Academic Alert system?		
a. process to let me know which courses to take	43	(10.9%)
b. mid-semester appraisal of my progress in my courses	251	(63.5%)
c. probation or suspension for low grades	21	(5.3%)
d. I don't know	80	(20.3%)
missing/miscoded 4		
5. Academic Alert letters should be sent to:		
a. no one	4	(1.0%)
b. new students only	4	(1.0%)
c. only students in academic difficulty	80	(20.2%)
d. both b. and c.	34	(8.6%)
e. everyone	274	(69.2%)
missing/miscoded 3		
6. My professors talked about Academic Alert in my class(es)		
a. yes	192	(48.4%)
b. no	187	(47.1%)
c. don't know	18	(4.5%)
missing/miscoded 2		
7. I recently received an Academic Alert letter from Miami-Dade telling me how I was progressing in my courses.		
a. yes	333	(83.5%)
b. no	59	(14.8%)
c. don't know	7	(1.7%)
8. I thought the information in the Academic Alert letter was accurate.		
a. yes	240	(72.5%)
b. no	74	(22.4%)
c. don't know	7	(5.1%)
missing/miscoded 2		
9. I thought the information in the Academic Alert letter was helpful.		
a. yes	273	(82.2%)
b. no	50	(15.1%)
c. don't know	9	(2.7%)
missing/miscoded 1		
10. I gained new information about my performance through the Academic Alert letter.		
a. yes	182	(54.7%)
b. no	142	(42.6%)
c. don't know	9	(2.7%)
11. The Academic Alert letter indicated that I needed to improve in one or more of my courses.		
a. yes	205	(61.6%)
b. no	126	(37.8%)
c. don't know	2	(0.6%)
12. Because of the Academic Alert letter I made a change (e.g., dropped a course, attended more regularly, studied more, saw an advisor).		
a. yes	198	(59.6%)
b. no	122	(36.8%)
c. don't know	12	(3.6%)
missing/miscoded 1		
13. Without the Academic Alert system, I wouldn't know how I stood at mid-term in all my courses.		
a. yes	199	(60.9%)
b. no	118	(36.1%)
c. don't know	10	(3.0%)
missing/miscoded 6		

October 24, 1990

Dear Faculty Member or Administrator:

Dr. McCabe has asked us to conduct an evaluation of the Academic Alert system. As part of the evaluation, you are being asked to complete the enclosed survey. The survey is short and should take no more than five to ten minutes of your time. Please complete the survey now. The survey should be returned to:

Office of Institutional Research
Room 1136
South Campus

Other pieces of the evaluation include a survey of students and interviews with individuals who work on the Academic Alert system (and an estimate from them of time and cost of the system).

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions or comments, please contact me at 7-2004 or at 7-7488 (after November 9th).

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Belcher
Research Associate, Sr.

sdm

Enclosure

Academic Administrator Survey of Academic Alert System

Directions: Please circle the answer to each question.

1. How much time per semester do you spend dealing with the Academic Alert system (e.g., filling out forms, talking to classes and faculty about Academic Alert, counseling students after they receive their letters)?

a. I do not participate in Academic Alert	9	(11.8%)
b. less than 5 hours	51	(67.1%)
c. 5-10 hours	9	(11.8%)
e. 11-15 hours	2	(2.6%)
d. more than 15 hours per semester	5	(6.7%)

2. Which of the following best describes the Academic Alert system?

a. process to tell students which courses to take	2	(2.6%)
b. mid-semester appraisal of course progress	72	(94.8%)
c. probation or suspension for low grades	0	(0.0%)
d. I don't know	2	(2.6%)

3. What is your guess on how much <u>each</u> Academic Alert letter costs including paper, postage and personnel?

a. Under $.50	14	(18.7%)
b. $ .50 - $.99	22	(29.3%)
c. $1.00 - $1.99	11	(14.7%)
d. $2.00 - $2.99	13	(17.3%)
e. $3.00 or more	15	(20.0%)
missing/miscoded 1		

4. We should eliminate Academic Alert if the <u>actual dollar savings</u> to the College exceeds:

a. $50,000	21	(29.6%)
b. $100,000	10	(14.1%)
c. $200,000	5	(7.0%)
d. should be eliminated even if under $50,000	22	(31.0%)
e. should be retained even if over $200,000	12	(16.9%)
missing/miscoded 6		

5. Academic Alert letters should be sent to:

a. no one	17	(22.4%)
b. new students only	1	(1.3%)
c. only students in academic difficulty	31	(40.8%)
d. both b. and c.	13	(17.1%)
e. everyone	14	(18.4%)

6. Without the Academic Alert system, students wouldn't know how they stood at mid-term.

a. yes	20	(26.7%)
b. no	51	(68.0%)
c. don't know	4	(5.3%)
missing/miscoded 1		

7. Some students improve their performance/attendance after receiving an Academic Alert letter.

a. yes	39	(51.3%)
b. no	14	(18.4%)
c. don't know	23	(30.3%)

8. Some students formally withdraw from a course after receiving an Academic Alert letter.

a. yes	45	(59.2%)
b. no	6	(7.9%)
c. don't know	25	(32.9%)

9. The Academic Alert letters provide new information to students.

a. yes	15	(19.7%)
b. no	44	(57.9%)
c. don't know	17	(22.4%)

10. There is general agreement among faculty about what constitutes satisfactory attendance or performance (when completing the Academic Alert forms).

a. yes	21	(27.6%)
b. no	38	(50.0%)
c. don't know	17	(22.4%)

11. I talk about Academic Alert to faculty.

a. yes	43	(56.6%)
b. no	33	(43.4%)

12. The Academic Alert information on the Agis form is used to advise students.

a. yes	32	(42.1%)
b. no	21	(27.6%)
c. don't know	23	(30.3%)

13. I have used the information gathered through Academic Alert to target groups of students for special attention.

a. yes	24	(31.6%)
b. no	51	(67.1%)
c. don't know	1	(1.3%)

14. Academic Alert has some administrative uses beyond informing students of their progress.

a. yes	29	(38.2%)
b. no	18	(23.6%)
c. don't know	29	(38.2%)

October 24, 1990

Dear Faculty Member or Administrator:

Dr. McCabe has asked us to conduct an evaluation of the Academic Alert system. As part of the evaluation, you are being asked to complete the enclosed survey. The survey is short and should take no more than five to ten minutes of your time. Please complete the survey now. The survey should be returned to:

Office of Institutional Research
Room 1136
South Campus

Other pieces of the evaluation include a survey of students and interviews with individuals who work on the Academic Alert system (and an estimate from them of time and cost of the system).

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions or comments, please contact me at 7-2004 or at 7-7488 (after November 9th).

Sincerely,

Marcia J. Belcher
Research Associate, Sr.

sdm

Enclosure

Directions: Please circle the answer to each question.

1. What is your status at the College?

a. full-time	522	(98.5%)
b. part-time	8	(1.5%)
missing/miscoded 1		

2. How many years have you taught at Miami-Dade?

a. this is my first year	28	(5.3%)
b. 2-5 years	86	(16.3%)
c. 6-10 years	64	(12.2%)
d. over 10 years	349	(66.2%)
missing/miscoded 4		

3. Which of the following best describes your role?

a. classroom faculty member	444	(84.1%)
b. advisor	7	(1.3%)
c. department chair	37	(7.0%)
d. other	40	(7.6%)
missing/miscoded 3		

4. How much time per semester do you spend dealing with the Academic Alert system (e.g., filling out forms, talking to classes about Academic Alert, counseling students after they receive their letters)?

a. I do not participate in Academic Alert	30	(5.7%)
b. less than 5 hours	342	(64.7%)
c. 5-10 hours	123	(23.2%)
e. 11-15 hours	11	(2.1%)
d. more than 15 hours per semester	23	(4.3%)
missing/miscoded 2		

5. Which of the following best describes the Academic Alert system?

a. process to tell students which courses to take	3	(0.6%)
b. mid-semester appraisal of course progress	488	(93.0%)
c. probation or suspension for low grades	9	(1.7%)
d. I don't know	25	(4.7%)
missing/miscoded 6		

6. What is your guess on how much <u>each</u> Academic Alert letter costs including paper, postage, personnel and computer services?

a. Under $.50	47	(8.3%)
b. $ .50 - $.99	147	(29.2%)
c. $1.00 - $1.99	129	(25.6%)
d. $2.00 - $2.99	72	(14.3%)
e. $3.00 or more	109	(21.6%)
missing/miscoded 27		

7. We should eliminate Academic Alert if the <u>actual dollar savings</u> to the College exceeds:

a. $50,000	132	(27.8%)
b. $100,000	57	(12.0%)
c. $200,000	28	(5.9%)
d. should be eliminated even if under $50,000	206	(43.4%)
e. should be retained even if over $200,000	52	(10.9%)
missing/miscoded 56		

8. Academic Alert letters should be sent to:

a. no one	153	(29.2%)
b. new students only	7	(1.3%)
c. only students in academic difficulty	220	(42.1%)
d. both b. and c.	59	(11.3%)
e. everyone	84	(16.1%)
missing/miscoded 8		

9. Without the Academic Alert system, students wouldn't know how they stood at mid-term.

a. yes	88	(16.8%)
b. no	399	(76.0%)
c. don't know	38	(7.2%)
missing/miscoded 6		

10. Some students improve their performance/attendance after receiving an Academic Alert letter.

a. yes	248	(47.0%)
b. no	160	(30.4%)
c. don't know	119	(22.6%)
missing/miscoded 4		

11. Some students formally withdraw from a course after receiving an Academic Alert letter.

a. yes	216	(41.1%)
b. no	117	(22.2%)
c. don't know	193	(36.7%)
missing/miscoded 5		

12. The Academic Alert letters provide new information to students.

a. yes	82	(15.5%)
b. no	360	(68.2%)
c. don't know	86	(16.3%)
missing/miscoded 3		

13. There is general agreement among faculty about what constitutes satisfactory attendance or performance (when completing the Academic Alert forms).

a. yes	158	(29.9%)
b. no	222	(42.1%)
c. don't know	148	(28.0%)
missing/miscoded 3		

14. I talk about Academic Alert to my students.

a. yes	305	(58.4%)
b. no	212	(40.6%)
c. don't know	5	(1.0%)
missing/miscoded 9		

15. I use Academic Alert information on the Agis form to advise students.

a. yes	147	(28.5%)
b. no	349	(67.6%)
c. don't know	20	(3.9%)
missing/miscoded 15		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

RSVP
ACADEMIC ALERT AND ADVISEMENT

Statistics for the Fall Term, (90-1)

Academic Alert and Advisement Committee
Kamala Anandam - District (Chairperson)
Rose Anne Roche - District
Max Lombard - North Campus
Karen Hayes - South Campus
Armando Ferrer - Mitchell Wolfson New World Center Campus
Jan Gordillo - Medical Center Campus
Richard Schinoff - Homestead Campus

Statistics Compiled by:
Rose Anne Roche

Division of Educational Technologies
MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
11011 S.W. 104 Street
Miami, Florida 33176

October, 1990

M E M O R A N D U M

October 27, 1990

TO: Individuals on Attached Distribution List

FROM: Kamala Anandam, Associate Dean,
Division of Educational Technologies

SUBJECT: **RSVP ACADEMIC ALERT AND ADVISEMENT REPORT FALL 90-1**

I am pleased to send you the attached report for your information and dissemination as you see fit. Thank you for your support and assistance.

cc: Dr. Jon Alexiou
Dr. J. Terence Kelly
Dr. Tessa Martinez Tagle
Dr. Robert McCabe
Dr. Eduardo Padron
Dr. Roy Phillips
Dr. William Stokes

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ACADEMIC ALERT STATISTICS

FALL TERM 90-1

North Campus

Carmen Casal, Registrar
Carol Cooper - Advisement and Counseling
Gina Cortes-Suarez - Assoc. Dean, Communication
John Corwin - Assoc. Dean for Occupational Careers
Dan Derrico - Dean for Administration
Ray Dunn - Dean for Student Services
Blanca Gonzalez - Chairperson, Acct. & Bus. Administration
John Greb - Assoc. Dean for Student Services
Brad Lawrence - Assoc. Dean for Natural Sciences
Max Lombard - Counseling/Advise./Career Servs. (Academic Alert Committee)
Marie Lopez - Registrar's Office
Jeffrey Lukenbill - Dean for Academic Affairs
Demie Mainieri - Assoc. Dean, Health, Phys. Ed. and Athletics
Doretha Nichson - Assoc. Dean for Community Services
Gregg Sharp - Director of Teaching & Learning Center
Celia Suarez - Assoc. Dean for Instruct. Support & Learning Resources

South Campus

Vayna Albury - Advisement and Counseling (Academic Alert Committee)
Ana Busto - Registrar's Office
Barbara Burt - Assoc. Dean for Language Arts
Sally Buxton - Dean for Administration
Zoila DeZayas - Dean, Community and Business Relations
Jeffrey Gathercole - Assoc. Dean for Extended Education
Cecilia Grasso - Assistant Registrar
Alexandria Halloway - Assoc. Dean for Humanities/Fine Arts
James Harvey - Associate Dean for Physical Education
Robert Hunter - Assoc. Dean for Social Science Division
Jane MacDonald - Assoc. Dean for Natural Science Division
Tom McKitterick - Dean for Academic Affairs
Herbert Robinson - Dean of Student Services
Tom Stewart - Registrar
Rudy Williams - Assoc. Dean for Occupational Education

Wolfson Campus

Castell Bryant - Dean of Students
Carmen Charles - Admissions and Records
Ray Fernandez - Associate Dean for Business
Armando Ferrer - Assoc. Dean for Academic Support (Academic Alert Comm.)
Ned Glenn - Assoc. Dean for Learning Resources
Irene Lipof - Assoc. Dean for Arts & Sciences
Suzanne Richter - Dean for Instruction
Albert Schlazer - Assoc. Dean for Health & Physical Ed. & Recreation
Kathleen Sigler - Dean for Administration
Erie Wilson - EA/EO Director of Equal Opportunity/Minority Affairs

Inter-American Center

John Kemppainen - Assoc. Dean for Admin. and Student Services
Jose Vicente - Dean for Inter-American Center

Medical Center

Kenneth A. Blye - Dean of Student and Instructional Support Services
Carol Clothier - Registrar
Sylvia Edge - Dean of Nursing Education
Arcie Ewell - Dean of Administration
Janis Gordillo - Academic Alert Committee
Cora Mazzagatti - Assoc. Dean of Nursing
Joanne Schoen - Dean of Allied Health Technology
Barbara Smith - Registrar's Office
Carleen Spano - Assoc. Dean for Instructional Support Services
Richard Townsend - Academic Services

Homestead

Richard Schinoff - Dean of Administration, Academic Alert Committee
Diana Pabon - Supervisor, Registration and Admissions

District

Clint Cooper - District Dean of Students
Marcia Belcher - Institutional Researcher, Senior
Harold Harper - Systems Analysis & Programming
Sam LaRoue - Director of Admissions and Registration
Barbara Maycox - Admissions & Registration Services

Miami-Dade Community College
RSVP Academic Alert and Advisement

PROGRESS ROLL STATISTICS FOR 90-1

	NC	SC	WC	MC	HC	TOTAL
Number of Progress Rolls Printed	1,754	2,261	1,356	387	155	5,913
Number of Progress Rolls Returned	1,638	2,218	1,356	379	153	5,744
% of Returns	93%	98%	100%	98%	99%	97%

Note: The statistics on the following pages include paid and non-paid students.

TABLE I

All Students for Fall Terms 1986-1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Number of students registered for credit	40,737	42,939	44,506	47,518	50,950
Number of students included in midterm evaluation*	38,980	40,591	42,452	44,585	48,051
Students with satisfactory progress	53%	53%	51%	51%	51%
Students needing improvement	42%	42%	45%	45%	45%
Students with no information	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Students with poor attendance	27%	29%	32%	31%	31%

*Percentages are computed for students enrolled in courses that were valid for evaluation halfway into the term. This excludes credit-by-exam, credit-for-life-experience, Open College, and short-term courses.

TABLE II

New Students for Fall Terms 1986 - 1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Number of students registered for credit	10,081	10,643	11,025	11,479	12,013
Number of students included in midterm evaluation*	9,481	9,695	10,280	10,430	11,008
Students with satisfactory progress	52%	51%	48%	49%	50%
Students needing improvement	43%	44%	48%	47%	46%
Students with no information	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Students with poor attendance	26%	27%	31%	31%	29%

*Percentages are computed for students enrolled in courses that were valid for evaluation halfway into the term. This excludes credit-by-exam, credit-for-life experience, Open College, and short-term courses.

TABLE III

Continuing Students for Fall Term 1986-1990

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Number of students registered for credit	30,656	32,296	33,481	36,039	38,937
Number of students included in midterm evaluation*	29,499	30,896	32,172	34,155	37,043
Students with satisfactory progress	52%	53%	51%	52%	51%
Students needing improvement	41%	42%	44%	44%	45%
Students with no information	6%	5%	5%	4%	4%
Students with poor attendance	28%	30%	32%	31%	31%

*Percentages are computed for students enrolled in courses that were valid for evalution halfway into the term. This excludes halfway into the term. This excludes credit-by-exam, credit-for-life experience, Open College, and short term courses.

Miami-Dade Community College
RSVP Academic Alert and Advisement 90-1

	NC	SC	WC	MC	HC	TOTAL
NEW STUDENTS						
Number of Students	3,736	4,847	2,392	686	352	12,013
MIDTERM PROGRESS						
Satisfactory in all courses	1,252	1,885	1,014	221	198	4,570
Satisfactory in courses reported	552	258	97	59	3	969
Improvement needed	1,465	2,298	927	200	109	4,999
No information	229	136	64	35	6	470
ATTENDANCE						
Improvement needed	1,116	1,411	604	100	59	3,290
PROGRAM CATEGORY						
Decided	2,375	3,575	1,680	476	169	8,275
Undecided	913	560	345	19	83	1,920
Non-degree	449	1,713	367	191	100	1,820
ADVISEMENT						
Faculty-advised	3,580	4,625	2,328	681	338	11,552
Self-advised	156	222	64	5	14	461
WITHDRAWAL SINCE 100% REFUND						
None	3,440	4,395	2,192	656	326	11,009
Some	296	452	200	30	26	1,004
ACADEMIC STANDING*						
Warning	13	11	8	2	1	35
Probation for withdrawals	4	1	2	0	0	7
Probation for GPA	18	28	14	2	2	64
Extended probation for withdrawals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Extended probation for GPA	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Academic Standing applies to transfer students.

Note: Open College, credit-by-exam, credit-for-life experience, and short-term courses are not included in the progress statistics for midterm progress. There were 1,005 in this exclusion (8%).

Miami-Dade Community College
RSVP Academic Alert and Advisement 90-1

CONTINUING STUDENTS

	NC	SC	WC	MC	HC	TOTAL
Number of Students	11,124	16,128	8,232	2,748	705	38,937
MIDTERM PROGRESS						
Satisfactory in all courses	3,872	6,517	3,318	1,062	425	15,194
Satisfactory in courses report	1,820	1,326	508	204	10	3,868
Improvement needed in all courses	565	1,108	664	163	63	2,563
Improvement needed in some courses	3,818	6,228	3,051	744	105	13,946
No information	653	451	205	147	16	1,472
ATTENDANCE						
Satisfactory in all courses	4,807	8,504	4,144	1,365	476	19,296
Improvement needed	3,482	5,093	2,591	484	103	11,753
PROGRAM CATEGORY						
Decided	9,119	13,202	6,784	2,377	452	31,934
Undecided	954	1,272	560	24	110	2,920
Non-degree	1,051	1,657	888	348	143	4,087
ADVISEMENT						
Faculty-advised	7,385	8,648	6,259	2,592	538	25,422
Self-advised	3,739	7,480	1,973	156	167	13,515
ACADEMIC STANDING						
Warning	435	707	355	87	35	1,619
Probation for withdrawals	164	258	111	26	11	570
Probation for GPA	552	735	286	106	27	1,706
Extended probation for withdrawals	155	343	141	39	6	684
Extended probation for GPA	51	48	22	10	0	131
Suspension for withdrawals	36	67	39	5	4	151
Suspension for GPA	19	20	8	3	1	51
Approved appeal after suspension	113	225	99	29	7	473
Approved appeal after dismissal	53	45	25	6	2	131

Note: Open College, credit-by-exam, credit-for-life experience, and short-term courses are not included in the progress statistics for mid-term progress. There were 1,894 students in this exclusion (4%).

Miami-Dade Community College
RSVP Academic Alert and Advisement 90-1

Special Messages

ALL STUDENTS

	NC	SC	WC	MC	HC	TOTAL
V.A. students whose progress is not satisfactory	13	13	3	4	2	35
International students taking fewer than 12 credits	49	55	18	15	0	137
Students whose native language is not English and progress is not satisfactory	2,565	4,117	3,230	475	50	10,437
Students who are registered for credits in excess of credit limitation under SOAP	370	455	195	64	6	1,091
Students who have earned 30+ credits and are still undecided about program	302	512	219	8	21	1,062
Students who have earned 30+ credits and are still in non-degree programs	419	602	301	142	21	1,485
Students who have not shown up for any class	272	313	102	13	1	701
Credit by exam	43	15	2	9	0	69
Life experience	0	0	0	1	0	1
Open College	276	144	201	39	1	661
Community extension	1	0	1	90	0	92
Fire Science	208	7	3	2	0	220

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges FEB 07 1992